

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON

March 10, 2000

The Honorable Charles T. Canady Chairman, Subcommittee on the Constitution Committee on the Judiciary U. S. House of Representatives H2-362 Ford House Office Building Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Canady:

Thank you for your letter regarding the Commission's initiative to promote the development of telecommunications competition in multiple tenant environments. On July 7, 1999, the Commission released its *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM)* in WT Docket No. 99-217 and CC Docket No. 96-98, Among other issues, the *NPRM* sought comment on the Commission's authority to take action to ensure that competitive telecommunications service providers will have reasonable and nondiscriminatory access to rights-of-way, buildings, rooftops, and facilities in multiple tenant environments. In your letter, you express concern regarding the constitutional implications of the potential actions discussed in the *NPRM*. I appreciate your invitation for the Commission to provide materials it believes would be useful to the Subcommittee in considering these issues. We have not prepared a cost-benefit analysis related to this issue. Moreover, given the current status of this proceeding, it would be premature for a Commission representative to testify at a hearing before the Subcommittee. However, my staff would be pleased to provide you and your staff with a briefing regarding the issues raised by the *NPRM*.

The NPRM represents one step in the Commission's ongoing efforts to foster competition in local telecommunications markets pursuant to Congress' directive in the Telecommunications Act of 1996. These efforts are intended to bring the benefits of competition, choice, and advanced services to all consumers of telecommunications, including businesses and residential customers, regardless of where they live or whether they own or rent their premises. In particular, the NPRM addresses issues that bear specifically on the availability of facilities-based telecommunications competition to customers in multiple tenant environments, such as apartment buildings, office buildings, office parks, shopping centers, and manufactured housing communities.

The purpose of this proceeding is to explore broadly which actions the Commission can and should take to promote facilities-based competition to the incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs). The item seeks comment on a wide range of potential Commission actions, in most instances without reaching any specific conclusions. For example, the item neutrally seeks comment on the legal and policy issues raised by a possible requirement that building owners who allow one or more telecommunications carriers access to facilities that they control make

comparable access available to other carriers on a nondiscriminatory basis. The item also requests comment on whether the Commission can and should extend to providers of telecommunications service rules prohibiting restrictions on the placement of antennas used for over-the-air reception similar to those adopted for video programming services under section 207 of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. In addition, the item proposes and seeks comment on potential obligations on ILECs and other public utilities to permit access to their in-building facilities under certain provisions of the Communications Act of 1934. Finally, the *NPRM* seeks comment on whether telecommunications providers, with or without market power, should be prohibited from entering into exclusive contracts with owners of multi-tenant dwelling buildings. You cite some of these issues in your letter, which we will place in the record of this proceeding.

As you note in your letter, the Commission has not reached any conclusions regarding the matters discussed in the NPRM. The Commission currently is reviewing nearly 1000 comments that were filed on the NPRM and a related Notice of Inquiry by telecommunications companies, electric utilities, building owners, and State and local governments, including a number of comments that address the constitutional issues. As your letter indicates, certain potential actions discussed in the NPRM raise important takings issues. The Commission has not yet resolved the NPRM, but let me assure you that we are committed to ensuring that any requirements we adopt comport with the Fifth Amendment. To this end, our General Counsel's office is working closely with other Commission staff to evaluate carefully the constitutional issues raised by the NPRM, including any potential for government liability under the "just compensation" provision of the Takings Clause. I want to assure you that our staff will be considering carefully these important and complex constitutional issues, as well as other legal and policy issues raised by the NPRM, before it makes its recommendations to the Commission for its consideration.

I appreciate your interest and participation in this proceeding, and look forward to working with you in examining this issue. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely, William Grand

William E. Kennard

Chairman

## EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DEC-06-99 13:02 FROM: REED SMITH WASH 12C OR

ID: 2024149259

PAGE 2 P. 03

6242

FAX NO. 2027398448

NOV-17-1989 WED 03:41 PM NAREIT MDU-17-1999 12114

COOPER CARUIN & ROSSATHAL LINE U

202 220 9607 P.03/04

## Congress of the United States

Kenner of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY 2126 Revision Mount Corner Bussins

WARRENDTO-L DG 30015-4214

Nevember 17, 1999

SEP - 7 2000

PEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED

Pederal Communications Commit 445 12th Street S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Chairman

The Monorable William E. Kenner

Dear Chairman Remord:

I have recently become awere of the Pulseal Communications Commission's Notice of Proposed Aniestalding (NURIA), WT Dockst No. 99-317, CC Dockst No. 96-98. The MPRM proposes, among other things: (1) to require owners of all "mustiple tenant environments" to provide seeses to their provides on a non-distributiony basis to may telescommunications provider that seeks such across, subject to speec and sufety constraints; (2) so probable restrictions that provest tounds in "much environments' from instilling entermer for according cervices, enterting an earlier, similar probibition with respect to attennes for video savyippe; and (3) to require local exchange companies ("LBC"s") and other public utilities to nicks their in-building facilities available comparies ("LEC's") and other public utilities to make their in-building facilities available to all eable companies and other telecommunications providers, regardless of the nature or entent of the rights of access of the LEC's and public Wilking

I understand and appreciate that the Commission has not taken action with respect to the proposals contained in the NFRM and that individual governissioners have expressed consume at to constitutional implications of the NPRM under the Fifth Amendment's Takings Classe. As Chairman of the Constitution Subscarreites of the House Judiciary Committee, I there the economy expressed by members of the Commission reserving the constructionality of the NITEM.

I am agreetly considering conducting a hearing on the constitutional implications of the NPRM early nest year. As an initial step, I insite the Commission to provide us with any metacials or information that it believes would be useful to the Bubocampittee in considering and reviewing the constitutional issues posed by the

> No. of Copies rec'd List ABCDE

NOV-17-1999 89180

255 JM6

P. 12

ID: 2824145255

P. 04

FAX NO. 2027399448

NOV-17-1999 WED 03:41 PM WARE IT

. -

12114 COOPER CHRUIN & ROSENTHAL

282 229 9607 P. 84/84

The Honorphie William E. Kennard November 17, 1999 Page 2

NPRM. We are pertinalarly interested in any cost-benefit easilysis that the Commission may wish to shere with the Subscrimities comparing the sestent of the problem sought to be corrected by the NPRM with the potential liability created by the "just compensation" provision of the Takings Clause. I emphasise that my interest in these issues does not imply that the Commission will not consider enrelially the constitutional and stanutory authority conserns that have been expressed regarding the NPRM.

The Sobcommittee will, of course, notify you of any hearing to be held and, in the event of such hearing, would invite the Commission to present testinosay.

Think you for your assistance.

Manuely yours,

Charles T. Canada

Chairman

Subsammittee on the Constitution